



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,204	01/30/2004	Chia-Chi Chung	MXIC-P910041DIV	7565
7590	06/14/2005		EXAMINER	LEE, HSIEN MING
Kenton R. Mullins Stout, Uxa, Buyan & Mullins, LLP Suite 300 4 Venture Irvine, CA 92618			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2823	
				DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/769,204	CHUNG, CHIA-CHI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hsien-ming Lee	2823

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 22-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 22 and 24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 23 and 25 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 9/10/2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

HSIEN-MING LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu et al. (US 6,448,606) in view of Thurgate et al. (US 6,366,501).

In re claim 22, Yu et al. , in Fig. 11 and related text, teach a memory device on a semiconductor substrate, comprising:

- a prepared semiconductor substrate 402;
- a plurality of bit lines (i.e. the regions between bit-line isolation 416-418;
- a plurality of trapping layer block structure 410 (i.e. an ONO structure); and
- a plurality of word lines 412 over the corresponding members of the plurality of trapping layer block structures 410.

Yu et al. do not teach that the widths of the plurality of trapping layer block structures are greater than of the word lines.

Thurgate et al., however, in the background art, suggest that using a greater width of trapping layer block structures than that of the word lines, it would achieve a sufficiently difference threshold voltages between programming and reading (col. 1, lines 48-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to include a greater width of the trapping layer block structure, as

suggested by Thurgate et al., in the memory device of Yu et al., since by this manner it would be beneficial to the memory operation.

In re claim 24, Yu et al. teach that the trapping layer block structure comprises in sequence, a first oxide layer, a nitride layer and a second oxide layer because the trapping layer block structure 410 in Yu et al. is an ONO structure.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 23 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record neither teaches nor suggest that at least one dielectric disposed between the plurality of word lines and the trapping layer block structures and the plurality of trapping layer block structures overlaps portions of the adjoining members of the plurality of bit lines.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hsien-ming Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-1863. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Thursday (8:00 ~ 6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on 571-272-1855. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hsien-ming Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2823

June 11, 2005

HSIEN-MING LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
